DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 237 881 CG 017 136

AUTHOR Schwartz, Lita Linzer
TITLE Parental Responses to Their Children's Cult Membership.
PUB DATE 27 Aug 83
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (91st, Anaheim, CA, August 26-30, 1983).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Conflict Resolution; *Court Litigation; Emotional Response; *Family Counseling; *Parent Attitudes; *Parent Child Relationship; Young Adults
IDENTIFIERS *Adult Children; *Cults

ABSTRACT

Most of the literature relevant to today's religious cults has paid scant attention to the parents of cult members. Two recent studies (1979 and 1982) of parents of ex-cult members revealed that initial parental responses to a child's cult involvement ranged from anxiety to terror. In general, the parents were baffled by their children's new affiliation, especially in those cases that began in the 1970's when there was little public awareness of cults. Negative parental reactions have been attributed to the threat cults pose to the family's economic goals and authority structure and to the appropriation of parental roles; few writers have recognized the disruption of the affectionate relationship within the family. Published accounts by parents of cult children reveal that parents often blame themselves, and that most had difficulty finding the child. Of the 49 ex-cult members in the 1979 and 1982 surveys, 31 were rescued by parents and 6 defected voluntarily. Parents have turned to kidnapping and deprogramming, conservatorship, and civil suits against the cults. Since most cult members are legally adults, and most cults have First Amendment protection as religious groups, the courts have provided few clear-cut remedies. Family therapy can help preserve the family unit and prepare the family for an eventual harmonious reconciliation, but it is not a function of the therapist to aid in abduction or deprogramming. (JAC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED237881

Parental Responses to Their Children's Cult Membership

Lita Linzer Schwartz

The Pennsylvania State University, Ogontz Campus

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lita Linzer Schwartz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG 017136

American Psychological Association

Division 36

Anaheim, CA: 27 August 1983

Abstract

Most of the literature published to today's "religious" cults has paid scant attention to the parents of cult members - hidden victims of this movement. Surveys of parents of ex-cult members have revealed their initial reactions and actions taken. Published parental narratives and sociologists' perceptions of parental reactions supplement the survey findings. Legal avenues to recovery of the young adult are discussed, leading to the conclusion that court cases to date have provided conflicting decisions in this area. Finally, the role of family therapy during and following the cult involvement period is examined.

When a young adult becomes a member of a totalistic group such as a cult, the resulting changes in the individual's perceptions, beliefs, attitudes, and behavior clearly have a ripple effect on other family members, especially the parents. Some parents react slowly to their child's new affiliation because they are unaware of the type of group involved. In other cases, the reaction is quick and belligerent, fueled by feelings of anger, guilt, and/or shame. Still other parents accept the cult involvement with equanimity, believing that whatever their child does is his or her choice and responsibility. Much depends, of course, on the long-term parent-child relationship, the parental personalities, the antecedents to the youth's commitment, and the type of advice received by the parents from extra-familial sources.

To study the impact of a youth's cult involvement on the parents, and their responses to it, two surveys were conducted of ex-cult members and their parents. In addition, published parental narratives have been informative on this matter. The parents are followed from their initial awareness and reactions through their immediate and long-term responses to cult involvement, and then to the resolution of their situations. Since many parents in the groups surveyed resorted to "rescuing" their children and then having them deprogrammed, the legal status of their actions in this direction is also examined. However urgently the parents viewed their decision to rescue, it has been perceived somewhat differently by some scholars. Their comments are therefore reviewed as well.

Finally, the family is examined in the post-cult stage. For most families, this has been a period of reconciliation, although sometimes

with renewed tensions. In some instances, these tensions led to a return to the cult or a refusal to leave it after being located by the parents. (Technically speaking, there never was a post-cult stage for such families.) Since family members are affected by their experience, they can be seen as "hidden victims" of the pervasive cult movement of the past two decades. They are so "hidden," in fact, that only a few researchers have considered their plight at all (Beckford, 1978a, 1978b; Kaslow & Schwartz, 1983; Schwartz, 1982; Zerin, 1983).

Questions to ask

Parents should not automatically assume that any unfamiliar group their child joins is a cult. They should ask questions of their child, or others, before hurling accusations or taking action precipitously. They might ask, for example:

1. Does the group identify itself as religious or political?
2. What are the group's goals and values?
3. Does the group try to change members' personalities?
4. Does the group "isolate members and preach that society is evil and that its devotees should help put a stop to evil and sin by turning to a charismatic religious leader?"
5. "Does the movement claim that it is a vehicle through which already existing alienation can be expressed or remedied." (Pavlos, 1982, p. 154)

Additional questions can be asked about the nature of the members' activities, financial demands or expectations by the group, and freedom of communication.

Armed with this information, the parents will be better prepared to take appropriate action, if it is warranted. Such a rational approach is the ideal, however. In reality, many parents respond to their child's new association on the basis of limited or no information.

Initial Parental Reactions

Survey results

Two recent studies of parents of ex-cult members revealed that the initial parental responses to awareness of their child's cult involvement included anxiety, worry, fear, confusion, shock, disbelief, helplessness, sadness, panic and terror. Only one parent (of 58 in the 1982 survey) cited no reaction; one felt that the youth would "outgrow" the affiliation; and one had a positive reaction. Various other terms used by the parents were: numb, rejected, opposed, skeptical, disappointed, angry, disapproving, devastated, guilty, "damned mad," stunned, ashamed. Two felt an immediate need to help their children, although they were unsure about how to do that at first. In general, it might be said that the parents were baffled by their children's new affiliation. This was particularly true for cases that began in the early 1970s when there was relatively little public awareness of cults in this country.

Are these parents different in some significant way from those in the general population? Were they unusually naive, perhaps? In the 1979 pilot study (Kaslow & Schwartz, 1983) and the 1982 study being reported here, the respondents (15 in 1979; 58 in 1982) were all biological parents of the ex-cult members. Most families were intact, except for three widows and one divorcee. The parents, like their sons and daughters, were

well-educated, with most having attended or graduated from college, and many having advanced or professional degrees. They did not present a pathological picture. Very few reported any involvement with drugs, those who used alcohol might be termed social drinkers, and less than 20% had ever had psychotherapy. In short, they appeared to be typical of the middle and upper-middle class population except for their lower rate of divorce.

In those instances where the youth had disappeared or left home as part of the new commitment, the parents were shocked, when they finally saw the youth again, by transformations in appearance and personality, "and grief-stricken at being totally deserted and replaced by the new cult 'family'" (Kaslow & Schwartz, 1983). Indeed, about one-eighth of respondent parents first became aware of their child's affiliation because of changes in personality. (Almost 40% of the parents, however, had been initially informed by the cult member that he or she had decided to be part of The Way International, or the Unification Church, or whichever group was the case.) Even when the youth continued to live at home, parents were dismayed by changes in diet, belief systems, growing intolerance of others, and reduced effectiveness in academic work or job performance.

Shupe and Bromley (1980) attributed such negative parental reactions to three factors: a) the threat that cult membership poses to the family's goal of preparing sons and daughters for participation in the economic order; b) the challenge made by cult membership to the authority structure of the family; and c) the appropriation in some cults, by the leaders, of the parental roles. There seems to be no recognition by these sociologists, or Robbins and Anthony (also sociologists), or other writers tending toward

the pro-cult end of the spectrum that there is an affectionate relationship developed within the family from infancy onward, even though it may vary in degree at different points during the family's development, and that it is the repudiation of this relationship that so pains and angers the parents. Anthony and Robbins stated, nevertheless, that some parents were guilty of an "hysterical overreaction" to cult membership (1981, p. 272).

It is true that part of the task of parenting is to prepare children for functionally independent adulthood, which includes vocational preparation. This is perceived by Shupe and Bromley in materialistic terms as an economic investment primarily. Few parents would agree with that evaluation. The affection and feeling of responsibility that parents hold even for their adult children is also not primarily an authoritarian relationship as it is seen by some sociologists. Rather, parents perceive the usurpation of the family of origin by the cult leader(s) as adding insult to the injury of separation.

Published parental reactions

Three parental reactions to their children's cult involvement have appeared in recent years that illustrate the survey results in more specific terms. Warren Adler, an author, was in England when his wife called him to say that their son had become involved with Rev. Sun Myung Moon's Unification Church. A friend had invited him to dinner and then for a weekend at the communal farm (Booneville). He remained at the farm for two weeks before letting anyone know where he was.

> The Moonies? I was groggy. I dimly saw Moon's pudgy face as it appeared on posters pasted up all over

> Washington, D.C., where we lived. I thought of stories of lost children, kidnapping, a bizarre cult, empty smiles. Was it Moon who said that God had put Nixon in the White House? Moon was something that happened to other people (Adler, 1978, p. 23).

He asked his wife "What happens now?" His wife quickly sought information and relayed it the following morning. What she had found out was disheartening.

A quite different experience occurred in the Hershell family. Their daughter was an idealist who had been with them in Haiti to help provide eye care in a clinic there. In the spring of her first year in college, she met some other idealists and shortly thereafter moved to the Unification Center to live with her new friends. She wrote her parents a long letter full of love for everyone and faith that the move was going to help her become a better person.

> Our first impulse was to ignore the letter, but after rereading it, certain things did not ring clear. . . . We thought that her intelligence would help her realize her mistake and she would get over it. But the more we read the letter, the more we became aware of a different flavor from her previous ones, but could not pinpoint the reasons. Too, we had not heard of a Unification Center, and after investigation, realized it was part of Unification Church, of which we knew nothing (Hershell & Hershell, 1981, p. 132).

The third parent to write about cult involvement from his perspective

was Steve Allen, the multi-talented entertainer and author. In 1971, he received a letter from his son Brian saying that he had joined the Church of Armageddon (a/k/a/ The Love Family).

> To all of us who loved Brian . . . the letter came as a bombshell. We were hurt and stunned. . . . We did not know what to think. Questions flooded our minds. Who was Love Israel? What was the Church of Armageddon? What experience had led Brian to such a dramatic and unexpected decision? Most of all, why? Why--especially in the light of the love we knew he felt for us all, stated twice in the letter--why had he chosen to turn his back on us, his family, his old friends in Los Angeles and, in a sense, the entire outside world? (Allen, 1982, p. 4).

In addition to seeking a rational explanation for seemingly irrational behavior, however, Allen wrote that he neither could nor would intrude on his son's privacy. "He was an adult. He had a right to live his own life. So we hoped for the best. And worried. And wondered. I knew one thing: I did not want to lose my son" (Allen, 1982, p. 4).

The Adlers, too, had asked "Why?" They concluded that they had been too indifferent to their son David, that they had been "unloving, self-centered, selfish, overprotective, indulgent parents" (Adler, 1978, p. 26). Allen commented that Brian seemed to lack the "mysterious inner ballast" that helps one find an identity, but at the same time blamed himself for Brian's actions--guilt over his divorce from Brian's mother, too little time spent with his sons, and his own emotional difficulties. The Hershells

similarly questioned their role in their daughter Jean's involvement with the Moonies. Like many other parents, they

> finally realized that it was not what we had or had not done, so we could stop beating on ourselves! It was a combination of many factors: it was the circumstances, it was the timing, it was the approach, it was the deception, the "love-bombing," the interplay. In short, it was the vulnerability of any and all young people. At any given time, any of them could be ripe to be entrapped (Hershell & Hershell, 1981, p. 133).

In each case, the parents, upon seeing their cult-involved child for the first time, commented upon the feeling of distance between them in addition to changes in physical appearance, deference to more senior members of the group, and a certain rigidity of expression.

Next Steps

Depending upon when in the past decade or so the young adult was recruited into a cult, the parents had varying degrees of knowledge about such groups. For those who became involved before 1975 or 1976, there was little information available in the popular press. These parents tended to turn to their clergyman, or social welfare agencies, or attorneys, all of whom tended to have as little knowledge as the parents. A few turned to the media for help, which provoked some journalistic investigations (Landes, 1976; Stoner & Parke, 1977; Warshaw, 1979).

More of the parents went to public libraries to seek information or somehow tapped into the parent networks. Often the latter route was a

devious one through "a friend of a friend" who knew someone else whose child was or had been in a cult. In the 1982 survey group, only two parents immediately sought a deprogrammer and 10 took no action at all. A few tried to persuade their children of the error they had made in accepting the ways of new friends so uncritically and precipitously, but commented that they were unsuccessful.

During the period of the young person's affiliation, almost all of the parents had some contact with their child, most often by phone, but not necessarily on a regular basis. Continuing communication, non-hortatory in tone, is recommended by most experts in the field, incidentally, as essential for any defection from the cult and reconciliation with the family to occur. For those living away from home, occasional visits to or by the parents were permitted, but only after the initial indoctrination phase had been completed. Typical of visits by the parents to a cult residence is the Adlers' first attempt to visit David at the Moonie camp:

> We moved to a variety of spots in the camp but were always surrounded by Moonies. Finally, David, following their lead, insisted we come into one of the cabins. We did so reluctantly and were seated in a semicircle around him (Adler, 1978, p. 27).

Eventually the Adlers saw their son alone for half an hour, and were able to schedule another meeting with him for the next day at the Moonie residence in San Francisco. In like manner, Steve Allen (1982) spent much of his first visit to Brian in the company of Serious Israel, one of the senior members of the Love Family. In the case of a young woman who was recruited by Hare Krishnas in mid-1976, the parents described their visit

nine days after their daughter's call as "devastating."

> Frances' parents reasoned, pleaded, cajoled, ordered, shouted, cried--and got nowhere. The only time the Ruftys glimpsed the Frances they had known occurred when their daughter inquired, "Aren't you even going to kiss me good-bye?" It was, Mrs. Rufty declares, "awful" (Post, 1978, p. 6).

Whether or not there were parent-child visits, the parents in most cases set about to redeem their child in some way. Of the 49 ex-cult members in the 1979 and 1982 surveys, 31 were rescued either by kidnapping or through use of the conservatorship power granted by a court and were subsequently deprogrammed. Only six defected voluntarily. In the remaining cases, the means of leaving the cult was through persuasion (often by another ex-cult member) or through deprogramming (without further description).

These varied means of retrieving a child from the cults have evoked much controversy. Groups such as FREECOG (Free our Children from the Children of God movement), American Family Foundation, and Citizens Freedom Foundation, composed largely of parents and relatives of cult members, are called anti-cult movements or ACM by Shupe and Bromley (1980; 1982). It is the contention of these two sociologists that since most cult members are legally adults, the ACM or parents acting independently "to remove their offspring forcibly from religious groups . . . constituted at the very least abrogations of the latters' civil rights and potentially involved assault and kidnapping" (Shupe & Bromley, 1982, pp. 106-107). This view

is supported by the American Civil Liberties Union and others, and has led to conflicting court decisions.

Legal Remedies

Since most cults characterize themselves as religious groups, their beliefs and activities (with some limited curbs on the latter possible) are protected under the First Amendment. Further, since the individuals recruited by cults are usually adults for legal purposes, they have the right to choose their religious beliefs independent of their parents. Thus when parents seek to extricate an adult child from a cult, they become involved with the law.

Conservatorship

Some parents, while their offspring are still in the cult, seek to obtain conservatorship or guardianship powers. "In such suits, parents have alleged that their adult children are incompetent to manage their own affairs as a result of being under 'mind control' exercised by cult leaders" (Schwartz & Zemel, 1980, p. 304). These powers have more typically been granted to families of elderly persons, but in recent years have been extended in some jurisdictions to the parents of cult members. Once obtained, the parents often use the time period permitted for the conservatorship to attempt to deprogram their offspring. A particularly complex case in which conservatorship was sought is Katz v. Superior Court. The parents of five Unification Church members petitioned for conservatorship powers. The trial judge granted the conservatorship order but also delayed its implementation for three days pending the outcome of an appeal. The appeals court ruled against the trial judge's

decision, but on the basis of incomplete arguments and weak analysis in the opinion of some legal scholars (Aronin, 1982). As a result, the Katz decision has had little weight in courts outside of California. Legislatures in California, New York, and other states have attempted to draft laws that would clarify the situation, but to date have accomplished little.

The issues to be confronted in drafting appropriate legislation include constitutional, policy, and procedural interests. The constitutional factors to be considered include the right of free exercise of religion (First Amendment), the right of freedom of association, and the right of the religious group to recruit members and indoctrinate them. Policy interests include the state's interest in preventing deception or fraud, in preserving individual accountability (actions undertaken with a free will), in fostering respect for and obedience to the law, in preventing deprogramming abuses, and, most pertinent here, in maintaining family stability. Finally, the procedural interests include due process, prompt and efficient adjudication of suits, and the cult's interest in participating in the legal proceedings (Aronin, 1982, pp. 209-228). In proposing a model for legislation, Aronin points out that

> From a constitutional perspective, it is essential that any criteria triggering guardianship under the statute must also implicate a state interest sufficient to justify the deprivation of liberty, together with any incidental infringement of other constitutional rights inherent in such a guardianship (1982, p. 234).

Sympathetic as lawmakers may be to the plight of the family, obviously they must consider primarily the constitutionality of proposed remedies. Even the state's policy interest in maintaining family stability, a concern critical to the perspective of this paper, must bow to the Constitution.

Kidnapping

A second avenue used by parents to extricate their children is kidnapping their offspring and then having them deprogrammed. The very term deprogramming provokes heated controversy. From the point of view of parents, deprogramming implies undoing the programming they perceive as practiced by cults. From the perspective of others, "Deprogramming consists of seizing a person, isolating him from his normal contacts, and barraging him with accusations, arguments, and threats until he breaks and renounces his religious affiliation" (Worthing, 1977, p. 10). Not all deprogrammers act as harshly as this definition suggests, and who "normal contacts" are varies with the perceiver (parents seeing themselves as "normal contacts" and more pro-cult or civil libertarian writers seeing cult associates as the "normal contacts").

Kidnapping, of course, is a criminal offense, even when the individual so taken is one's own child. Although non-familial kidnappers have been imprisoned, usually with light sentences, no family members (of whom the author is aware) have been jailed, although several have been placed on probation for the offense. "Deprogrammers prosecuted for kidnapping or false imprisonment have relied on the necessity defense, which has traditionally exculpated defendants who violated a law to avoid a greater

evil than the law was designed to prevent" (Cults, deprogrammers, . . . , 1981, pp. 272-273). Critical to such a defense, whether of family members or others, is the concept that "the harm likely to be avoided clearly outweighed the harm likely to be caused" (Cults, deprogrammers, . . . , 1981, p. 282). A second defense is that the kidnapping occurred under duress--fear that a family member, for example, is at risk of death or serious injury (Cults, deprogrammers, . . . , 1981, p. 288). Parents might conceivably view emotional distress or "mind manipulation" as indicative of such serious injury.

Civil suits

A third path toward rescue is filing suit against the cults on the grounds of alienation of affections, false imprisonment, misrepresentation, or fraud. Since state statutes vary in these matters, a definitive position on this legal approach is difficult to take.

> In Schuppin v. Unification Church, the parents alleged that the Church had used mind control to alienate their daughter's affections. Their claim was held to be unfounded. Similarly, false imprisonment, charged against the leaders of the Hare Krishna group in People v. Murphy, was disallowed as a means of recovering a convert from that group" (Schwartz & Zemel, 1980, p. 304).

The parents in the Katz case (1977) sought to recover their children on the grounds that the recruiters for the Unification Church had misrepresented the facts when approaching and indoctrinating their children. (The young people, then still in the Church, testified against their

parents, alleging that they had full prior knowledge of the commitments to be made.) If deception was used, such behavior would be actionable, but in the Katz case, the plaintiffs lost.

Few ex-cult members, who might institute suit on firmer grounds than their parents could, have sued. Their feelings of fear, shame, guilt, a desire for closure with respect to the cult period in their lives, and recognition of the heavy costs in time, money, and emotional turmoil, have been the reasons precluding such action (Schwartz & Zemel, 1980). Class action suits by groups of ex-cult members might reduce some of these pressures, however. Among those few suits entered, Titchbourne, a former member of the Church of Scientology, succeeded in winning her case based on fraudulent promises made by recruiters (Philadelphia Inquirer, August 16, 1979), and Dole, an ex-Moonie, sued the Unification Church on the grounds of alienation of affections and for "losing control" of her life through misrepresentation (Philadelphia Bulletin, April 15, 1981).

What is more painful for parents is being sued by their children. In one case known to the author, a young woman who has been in the Divine Light Mission for about ten years, and who has been kidnapped and deprogrammed three times--only to return to the DLM while incompletely deprogrammed, successfully filed suit against her parents for their actions. The parents were then placed on two years' probation by a Colorado judge, enjoined from seeking to "rescue" their daughter during that period. In a second case, Thomas Ward, a member of the Unification Church, has been empowered by the Supreme Court to use the Ku Klux Klan

Act of 1871 as the basis for his suit against his parents, siblings, and others for their attempt to abduct and deprogram him (Philadelphia Inquirer, January 19, 1982). Several other cases have been instituted by cult members, with inconclusive results. As De Socio pointed out,

> The continuum that the courts must span is indeed a large one, ranging from the initial point of freedom of choice to the opposite end, where deprivations such as brainwashing are alleged to have taken place. In all likelihood, courts will not intervene at the correct point in the continuum in every case, but courts must enter at some point if parties are to be vindicated for a lack of human rights violations or condemned for their existence (1979, p. 52).

The Family After the Fact

Reconciliation

There are two major goals in therapy with families of cult members. One is to preserve the family unit and the other is to prepare the family for an harmonious reconciliation with the absent child. It is not a function of the therapist to aid in abduction and deprogramming. The therapist's aim is to aid the parents in dealing with a crisis.

The initial tasks of the therapist are to deal with the varied emotions, described earlier, that the distraught parents bring to the office and to provide support during the grief process. Next the therapist should provide knowledgeable answers to the many questions the parents may have regarding cults. This information should include the fact that

kidnapping of an adult child, even by parents, is a crime. Referral to a parent network for additional support and guidance, however, is appropriate even while therapy continues. Reassurance should be given that blame for the cult involvement is not all theirs, and generally not the fault of one parent to the exclusion of the other (Schwartz, 1982). However, as part of the preparation for the future, the parents should explore, with the therapist, what in the family situation might have contributed to their child's vulnerability and what in the family relationships might be improved. The parents should also be urged to maintain an affectionate and non-critical communication with their child if they hope to become reconciled.

If and when the young adult returns to the family, some conjoint family therapy is recommended to discuss everyone's feelings at different points of the cult episode. The therapist must be alert to keep the discussion tactful rather than confrontative. In particular, the parents must be helped to see themselves as their child views them if needed changes in attitude and behavior are to occur.

Return to the Cult

There are many cases in which the return to the family of origin either never occurs or is temporary. Whether the deprogramming is ineffective, or the young adult is still vulnerable to the appeals of peers in the cult, or life in the cult simply seems more desirable than life in the larger society, the young adult returns to or remains with the group. For a specific cult member, the critical issue may be relief from worldly pressures, status in the cult hierarchy, or belief in the theology or

practices of the group.

For the parents, there is a renewed sense of failure and grief if they have attempted a rescue. Supportive therapy is again indicated. If there are younger children, they need to be protected from the in-cult sibling should he or she attempt to recruit them, and they may also need support for their self-esteem. It is important to maintain the family as a unit, with the younger children attended to rather than being neglected or unseen because of the primary crisis.

Summary

Most of the articles and books published relevant to today's cult groups have paid scant attention to the parents of cult members. From questionnaire responses and published accounts, initial parental reactions have been related as well as the steps taken by parents following their awareness of the situation in which their adult child is involved. Sociologists' views of parental reactions offer a contrapuntal note.

Legal avenues to recovery of the young adult are discussed, leading to the conclusion that court cases to date have provided few clear-cut decisions in this area. Finally, the role of family therapy in reconstructing the family unit during the cult involvement period and after the return of the cult member is examined.

References

Adler, W. (1978, June 6). Rescuing David from the Moonies. Esquire, 23-30.

Allen, S. (1982). Beloved son: A story of the Jesus cults. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Anthony, D., and Robbins, T. (1981). New religions, families, and "brainwashing." In T. Robbins and D. Anthony, eds., In gods we trust. New Brunswick: Transaction Press, pp. 263-274.

Aronin, D. (1982). Cults, deprogramming, and guardianship: A model legislative proposal. Columbia Journal of Law and Social Problems, 17 (2), 163-286.

Beckford, J. A. (1978a). Cults and cures. Japanese Journal of Religious Studies, 5, 225-257.

Beckford, J. A. (1978b). Through the looking-glass and out the other side. Archives de Sciences Sociales des Religious, 45 (1), 95-116.

Cults, deprogrammers, and the necessity defense. (1981) Michigan Law Review, 80 (2), 271-311.

DeSocio, W. G. (1979). Protecting the rights of religious cults. Human Rights, 8 (3), 38-41, 52, 56.

Hershell, M., and Hershell, B. (1981). Our involvement with a cult. Marriage & Family Review, 4 (3/4), 131-140.

Kaslow, F. W., and Schwartz, L. L. (1983). Vulnerability and invulnerability to the cults: An assessment of family dynamics, functioning, and values. In D. Bagarozzi, et al., eds., New perspectives in marriage and family therapy: Issues in theory, research, and practice. New York: Human Sciences Press.

Katz v. Superior Court. 73 Cal. App. ed 952, 141 Cal. Rptr. 234 (1977).

Landes, M. G. (1976, September). Making of a Moonie. Atlas World Press Review, 29-32.

Pavlos, A. J. (1982). The cult experience. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

Post, R. (1978). Coming home from a cult. The Lutheran, 16 (16), 4-7.

Schwartz, L. L. (1982). Therapy with families of cult members. In A. S. Gurman, ed., Questions and answers in the practice of family therapy, Vol. 2. New York: Brunner/Mazel, pp. 78-81.

Schwartz, L. L., and Zemel, J. L. (1980). Religious cults: Family concerns and the law. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 6, 301-308.

Shupe, A. D., Jr., and Bromley, D. G. (1980). The new vigilantes: Deprogrammers, anti-cultists, and the new religions. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Shupe, A. D., Jr., and Bromley, D. G. (1982). Shaping the public response to Jonestown: People's Temple and the anticult movement. In K. Levi, ed., Violence and Religious Commitment: Implications of Jim Jones's People's Temple movement. University Park; The Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 105-132.

Worthing, S. L. (1977, May). Deprogramming and religious freedom. Church and State, pp. 10-15.

Zerin, M. F. (1983, June). The Pied Piper phenomenon: Family systems and vulnerability to cults. Scientific research and new religions. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Pacific Division, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Utah State Universtiy, Logan.